

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **17 June 2005**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-24. Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1, 9, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph and second paragraph

Claims 1-24 were rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1, 9, and 17 were rejected as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 to comply with the written description requirement and to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. These amendments find support in FIG. 4 and in paragraphs [0032]-[0033] of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 9, and 17 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-8, which depend upon claim 1, claims 10-16, which depend upon claim 9, and claims 18-24, which depend upon claim 17, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By


Edward J. Grundler

Registration No. 47,615

Date: 11 July 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665